

KILLING SPINORS, SUPERSYMMETRIES AND ROTATING INTERSECTING BRANES

P.K. TOWNSEND

*DAMTP, University of Cambridge,
Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9EW, UK
E-mail: pkt10@damtp.cam.ac.uk*

I review a recently proposed method for determining the symmetry superalgebra of a supergravity configuration from its Killing spinors, and its application to the ‘near-horizon’ limits of various rotating and intersecting branes.

A configuration of gravitational and matter fields is said to possess a symmetry if there is an infinitesimal coordinate transformation, associated with some non-zero vector field ξ , that leaves invariant all fields, including the metric. The invariance of the metric implies that ξ is Killing and the set of all such fields closes under commutation to define the symmetry algebra of the field configuration. For a supergravity theory one might analogously define a ‘supersymmetric’ configuration to be one for which there is an infinitesimal local supersymmetry transformation, associated with a non-zero anticommuting spinor field ϵ , that leaves invariant all fields. In this case, however, it is far from clear how one extracts the symmetry superalgebra from the knowledge of these spinors. To begin with, there is no way to construct an ordinary vector field from anticommuting spinors. To circumvent this problem we may note that ϵ is defined by a set of *linear* differential equations, so a supersymmetric field configuration is naturally associated with a common zero mode of a set of differential operators. This zero mode is a *commuting* spinor, but it will generally have both a ‘body’ and a ‘soul’. The body is an ‘ordinary’ commuting spinor, ζ , satisfying the same equations as ϵ but with all background fermions set to zero. For such purely bosonic backgrounds the supersymmetry variations of the bosons vanish identically so the equations determining ζ are found from the supersymmetry variations of the fermions. These are the Killing spinor equations, and the solutions are the Killing spinors. Thus, the number of supersymmetries of a purely bosonic background equals the dimension of the space of linearly independent Killing spinors.

Killing vectors may now be constructed as bilinears of Killing spinors. It is not difficult to verify that the vector field $\bar{\zeta}\Gamma^m\zeta'\partial_m$ is Killing if the spinor fields ζ and ζ' are. This suggests that the symmetry superalgebra is determined by the Killing spinor fields (up to purely bosonic factors) just as the bosonic symmetry algebra is determined by the Killing vector fields. One way

to see how this works¹ starts by considering the supergravity field configuration of interest as a background for small fluctuations. Given a Killing spinor or vector field of the background it is then possible to construct a time-independent charge as a functional of the fluctuation fields. One thus finds a set of fermionic charges $Q_F(\zeta)$ and a set of bosonic charges $Q_B(\xi)$ for which the (anti)commutators may be computed via the canonical (anti)commutation relations of the fluctuation fields¹. For the bosonic charges one has

$$[Q_B(\xi), Q_B(\xi')] = Q_B([\xi, \xi']), \quad (1)$$

so that the algebra of bosonic charges is homomorphic to the algebra of Killing vector fields. For the mixed bosonic, fermionic commutator one has

$$[Q_B(\xi), Q_F(\zeta)] = Q_B(\mathcal{L}_\xi \zeta), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ is the Lie derivative with respect to ξ . Note that the Lie-derivative of a spinor field with respect to a vector field is defined only if latter is Killing, as is the case here. Finally, and most importantly, one has

$$\{Q_F(\zeta), Q_B(\zeta')\} = Q_B(\xi) \quad (3)$$

where

$$\xi^m = \bar{\zeta} \Gamma^m \zeta'. \quad (4)$$

What this shows¹ is that *the linear combination ξ of Killing vector fields associated to any pair of Killing spinor fields, ζ and ζ' , is the same as the linear combination $Q_B(\xi)$ of bosonic charges appearing in the anticommutator of the fermionic charges $Q_F(\zeta)$ and $Q_F(\zeta')$* . In this way, the symmetry superalgebra may indeed be deduced, up to purely bosonic factors, from the Killing spinors.

In many cases this fact is not needed because a knowledge of the bosonic symmetry algebra and the number of supersymmetries suffices to determine the superalgebra. A simple example is the maximally supersymmetric $adS_2 \times S^2$ Bertotti-Robinson solution of N=2 D=4 supergravity, which arises as the near-horizon limit of the extreme Reissner-Nordström (RN) black hole^{2,3}. This information is sufficient to determine the symmetry superalgebra; it can only be $su(1,1|2)$, for which the bosonic subalgebra is $su(1,1) \oplus su(2)$. Many higher-dimensional maximally supersymmetric adS_{p+2} spacetimes arise in a similar way as near-horizon limits of p-brane solutions of supergravity theories⁴, and if one runs through the list of anti-de Sitter superalgebras⁵ then one usually finds that there is only one candidate. An interesting exception occurs for certain adS_2 and adS_3 cases. As adS_3 superalgebras are direct sums of two

adS_2 superalgebras, we may concentrate on the adS_2 case. There is a one-parameter family of adS_2 superalgebras,

$$D(2|1; \alpha) \supset su(1, 1) \oplus su(2) \oplus su(2). \quad (5)$$

The parameter $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ is the relative weight of the two $su(2)$ subalgebras. When $\alpha = 1$ we have the isomorphism

$$D(2|1; \alpha) \cong osp(4|2; \mathbb{R}), \quad (6)$$

and it is convenient to define

$$D(2|1; 0) = su(1, 1|2) \oplus su(2). \quad (7)$$

Clearly, the parameter α is not determined by a knowledge of the bosonic symmetry algebra and the number of supersymmetries. The simplest case in which this ambiguity arises is the D=5 extreme Tangherlini black hole, which is the D=5 generalization of the extreme RN black hole. This is a solution of D=5 supergravity with a maximally supersymmetric $adS_2 \times S^3$ near-horizon limit⁶. This near-horizon solution therefore has eight supersymmetries and is invariant under the isometry group of $adS_2 \times S^3$. The superalgebra must be $D(2|1; \alpha)$ for some α , but what is the value of α ?

In this case there is an indirect argument that α must vanish. This comes from consideration of angular momentum. It will prove useful to first consider rotation in the context of D=4 black holes. The general stationary D=4 black hole solution depends on one angular momentum parameter, in addition to its mass and charge parameters, but the requirement of supersymmetry forces the angular momentum to vanish. This could seem puzzling in view of the fact that angular momentum does not appear in the anticommutator of supersymmetry charges of the super-Poincaré algebra, because this fact implies that every non-rotating supersymmetric solution is a member of a class of rotating supersymmetric solutions. Indeed it is, but all the rotating solutions have naked singularities and so fail to qualify as ‘black holes’. As an aside, I remark that angular momentum *does* appear in the anticommutator of supersymmetry charges of the adS superalgebra, so in this case the value of the angular momentum is of direct relevance to supersymmetry. In fact, it turns out⁷ that asymptotically adS supersymmetric D=4 black holes are *necessarily* rotating; now it is the non-rotating supersymmetric solutions that are singular!

Returning to D=5, we first note that the general stationary asymptotically flat solution will depend on two angular momenta⁸, corresponding to rotation in two independent 2-planes. When both vanish we have a static black hole with $SO(4)$ hyperspherical symmetry. When they are non-zero but equal the

symmetry is reduced to $SO(3) \times SO(2)$ and when they are unequal it is further reduced to $SO(2) \times SO(2)$. In the context of D=5 supergravity these groups become

$$SU(2) \times SU(2) \supset SU(2) \times U(1) \supset U(1) \times U(1). \quad (8)$$

It turns out that supersymmetry requires both angular momenta to be equal⁹. Let j be the one independent angular momentum parameter of the supersymmetric black hole solutions; for an appropriate normalization one finds that non-singularity on and outside the event horizon requires $|j| < 1$. When $j = 0$ we have the Tangherlini BH with its $adS_2 \times S^3$ near-horizon geometry. When $j \neq 0$ we have a rotating version with a near horizon geometry that is no longer a direct product. Let σ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) be the three left-invariant 1-forms on S^3 satisfying $d\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \wedge \sigma_3$ and cyclic permutations; then $d\Omega_3^2 = (1/4)(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2)$ is the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ invariant metric on the unit sphere. In this notation the near-horizon metric of the rotating supersymmetric D=5 black hole is¹⁰

$$ds^2 = -(r^2 dt + \frac{j}{2} \sigma_3)^2 + r^{-2} dr^2 + d\Omega_3^2 \quad (9)$$

This metric is clearly $SU(2) \times U(1)$ invariant, and at least 1/2 supersymmetric, but its full isometry supergroup is far from evident. An analysis of the Killing spinor equations reveals that supersymmetry is again fully restored in the near-horizon limit¹¹. This is remarkable because it suggests that rotation reduces the near-horizon isometry group without reducing its supersymmetry. This would be hard to understand unless the $SU(2)$ factor that is broken to $U(1)$ by the rotation is a purely bosonic factor of the isometry supergroup, and this is the case only if $\alpha = 0$. In fact, a direct determination¹⁰ of the symmetry superalgebra using the method described above confirms that the near-horizon symmetry superalgebra of the D=5 supersymmetric black hole is $su(1, 1|2) \oplus su(2)$, when $j = 0$, and $su(1, 1|2) \oplus u(1)$ when $j \neq 0$. It also determines the $su(1, 1)$ Killing vector fields to be^a

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \partial_t \\ d &= r\partial_r - 2t\partial_t \\ k &= [(1 - j^2)r^{-4} + 4t^2]\partial_t - 4tr\partial_r + 2jr^{-2}m, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where m is the conventionally normalized Killing vector field associated with the angular momentum parameter j . The remaining $su(2)$ Killing vector fields in the bosonic subalgebra of $su(1, 1|2)$ are the right-invariant vector fields on S^3 .

^aThe notation used here differs from that of ref. 10.

Supersymmetric D=5 black holes have various interpretations as intersecting M-branes. The most straightforward is as three intersecting¹², and possibly rotating¹³, M2-branes, customarily denoted by $(0|M2, M2, M2)$. Compactification on the 6-dimensional space spanned by the M2-branes yields a 1/8 supersymmetric solution of T^6 -compactified D=11 supergravity, and a subclass (the ‘Güven’ class) yields 1/2 supersymmetric solutions of the equations of pure D=5 supergravity. An instructive, although less direct, route begins from the dual $(1|MW, M2, M5)$ configuration. Wrapping the M2-brane on a circle and the M5-brane on a 4-torus yields a 1/8 supersymmetric string solution of T^5 -compactified D=11 supergravity. The ‘Güven’ subclass now yields a 1/2 supersymmetric solution of the pure (1,1) supersymmetric D=6 supergravity for which the near-horizon geometry is $adS_3 \times S^3$, irrespective of the rotation¹⁴ because its effects can be removed *in the near-horizon limit* by a coordinate transformation. The symmetry superalgebra of this near-horizon solution is

$$su(1, 1|2)_L \oplus su(1, 1|2)_R. \quad (11)$$

The total number of supersymmetries is thus 16, which is double that of the D=5 black hole, but only the ‘left’ supersymmetries survive further reduction on S^1 . Moreover, the identification needed to perform this reduction is not preserved by the coordinate transformation needed to remove the effects of rotation in the near-horizon limit¹, so that the near-horizon geometry in D=5 depends on the rotation parameter, in agreement with the direct analysis in D=5. In fact, $SU(1, 1|2)_R$ is broken to $SU(2)$ for zero rotation and to $U(1)$ for non-zero rotation. We thus recover the D=5 results deduced earlier.

The 1/8 supersymmetric $(1|MW, M2, M5)$ configuration of M-theory is a special case of the 1/8 supersymmetric $(1|MW, M2, M5, M5)$ configuration. For an appropriate choice of the various (generalized) harmonic functions associated with the M-Wave, M2-brane and M5-brane components, there is a non-singular near-horizon limit with $adS_3 \times S^3 \times S^3 \times \mathbb{E}^2$ geometry^{15,16}, with the ratio of the two S^3 radii equal to the ratio of the two M5-brane charges. The number of independent Killing spinors is 16, which represents a *fourfold* increase in supersymmetry relative to the full intersecting brane configuration (as was the case for the $(1|MW, M2, M5)$ configuration). The reason for this is that the M-Wave is irrelevant in the near-horizon limit because there are no local degrees of freedom of the gravitational field in adS_3 .

The 1/2 supersymmetric $adS \times S^3 \times S^3 \times \mathbb{E}^2$ solution of D=11 supergravity can obviously be viewed as a 1/2 supersymmetric $adS_3 \times S^3 \times S^3$ solution of D=9 maximal supergravity. We now face the problem of determining the isometry superalgebra of this solution. Indirect arguments¹⁶ suggest that it

should be

$$D(2|1; \alpha) \oplus D(2|1; \alpha) \quad (12)$$

with α the ratio of the two S^3 radii. The removal of one M5-brane corresponds to taking this ratio to zero, and hence to $\alpha = 0$, which we earlier saw to be correct. However, these arguments are only suggestive and this example provides what is perhaps the best illustration of the need for a systematic method. An application of the method described earlier confirms¹ that the superalgebra is indeed $D(2|1; \alpha)$, with α the ratio of the two S^3 radii. Thus all values of the parameter α of the *adS* superalgebra $D(2|1; \alpha)$ have a physical realization within M-theory.

References

1. J.P. Gauntlett, R.C. Myers and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 025001 (1999).
2. B. Carter, in *Black Holes*, eds. C. and B. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, New York 1973).
3. G.W. Gibbons, in *Supersymmetry, Supergravity and Related Topics*, eds. F. Del Aguila, J.A. de Azcárraga and L.E. Ibañez (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).
4. G.W. Gibbons and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3754 (1993).
5. W. Nahm, *Nucl. Phys. B* **135**, 149 (1978).
6. A. Chamseddine, S. Ferrara, G.W. Gibbons and R. Kallosh, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 3647 (1977).
7. V.A. Kostelecky and M.J. Perry, *Phys. Lett. B* **371**, 191 (1996).
8. R.C. Myers and M.J. Perry, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **172**, 304 (1986).
9. J.C. Breckenridge, R.C. Myers, A.W. Peet and C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett. B* **391**, 93 (1997).
10. J.P. Gauntlett, R.C. Myers and P.K. Townsend, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 1 (1999).
11. R. Kallosh, A. Rajaraman and W.K. Wong, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 3246 (1977).
12. G. Papadopoulos and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett. B* **380**, 273 (1996).
13. M. Cvetič and D. Youm, *Nucl. Phys. B* **499**, 253 (1997).
14. M. Cvetič and F. Larsen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **531**, 239 (1998).
15. P.M. Cowdall and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 281 (1988); *erratum: Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 281 (1998).
16. H.J. Boonstra, B. Peeters and K. Skenderis, *Nucl. Phys. B* **533**, 127 (1988).